The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 10
No. 1

NOVEMBER
1916

SUFFRAGE ROUTED IN TWO MORE STATES

"PROTEST" ESTIMATE ALMOST EXACT

MILITANT METHODS IN ACTION

SUFFRAGE BY THREAT

ANOTHER DANGER

WHY WE OPPOSE THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

WHAT REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT MEANS

A FINAL ANSWER TO OFT-REPEATED QUESTIONS

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
NOV 28 1916
PERIODICAL DIVISION

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1913, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

37 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.; Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland, Me.
Secretary, Mrs. William B. Glover, Fairfield Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Glen Ridge, N. J.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. John Balch, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Trenton, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Baltimore, Md.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupont, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.
President, Mrs. C. H. Davis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Joseph M. Stoddard.
Treasurer, Miss Alys Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. George B. Puller.
Recording Secretary, Miss Annie Squire.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Water D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 3 Hippee Building, Des Moines.
President, Mrs. Simon Cassady.
Secretary, Mrs. Harry Phillips.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Rollins.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter.
President, Mrs. John F. A. Merrill, 94 Neal Street, Portland.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler.
Secretary, Miss Alice Wood, 206 State Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. Wm. H. Bradford.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Michael B. Wild.
Treasurer, Mrs. Rosalie Straus.
Chairman, Membership Committee, Mrs. W. P. E. Wyse, Pikesville.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Executive Secretary, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, 611 Roland Avenue, Roland Park, Md.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.
President, Mrs. John Balch.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome

MINNESOTA

President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. F. Crofoot, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.
Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th Street, New York.
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo.
First Vice-President, Mrs. N. C. Frick.
Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell, Fargo.
Executive Committee, Mrs. N. C. Young, Mrs. W. J. Howe, Mrs. D. B. Holt.

OHIO

Office: 804 Neave Building, Cincinnati.
President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1108 Finance Building, 1426 South Penn Square, Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard. Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield, Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B. Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Chairman Press Committee, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Postoffice Box 368, Richmond.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherfoord.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell

WEST VIRGINIA

808 Kanawha Street, Charleston.
Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Miss Mary Atwood.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt, Madison.
Secretary, Miss Gertrude Bean, 4 Prospect Ave., Milwaukee.
Treasurer, Mrs. Ellis B. Usher.

SUFFRAGE ROUTED IN TWO MORE STATES

WEST VIRGINIA

By Mrs. D. C. Gallaher
President, West Virginia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

(INCOMPLETE RETURNS)

Against Suffrage	96,252
For Suffrage	45,382
Anti-Suffrage Majority	50,870

AFTER the first, and it is hoped the last, campaign in West Virginia wherein woman suffrage may be an element, anti-suffrage people all over our country must share our delight that it has been overwhelmingly defeated at the polls. When the political campaign first opened the suffrage speakers and emissaries came "not as single spies but in battalions," and soon their usually intolerant resentment was visited upon all who saw fit to differ from them. At both the Republican and the Democratic State Conventions their speakers, Mrs. Carrie C. Catt and Miss Antoinnette Funk, appeared, but were overwhelmingly routed by Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, whose fame thence went out to every county with the returning delegates.

Soon appeals began coming in for Mrs. Oliphant to be sent to almost every county. Meanwhile, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, our President, and Miss Marjorie Dorman had visited West Virginia and spoken to large audiences of our best people, and thus organized and aroused public sentiment theretofore unawakened, and perhaps indifferent. No sooner had the militant and misguided minority shown unfair and offensive tactics than the voters and the vast majority of our women became aroused, and began to realize with a just dread what such a calamity was threatened our State by these women. For a while it was vainly hoped by the "antis" that the campaign might be conducted upon a plane of fair and respectful discussion. With "boiler plate" screeds, hoary with age, worn thread-bare and refuted in other States, paid advertisements, soap-box orators in every county and on street corners, and booths at every county fair they waged their combat. The women of our own State who sympathize with them, with some male anemic so-called orators and writers, were seemingly at the outset fairly disposed, but the imported firebrands soon had our resident suffragists inflamed and embittered. Slanders and false charges flew thick and fast, their high priestesses, including Miss Shaw, taking no exception to offensive methods. There is a diversity of opinion as to whether or not the voters would have utterly defeated suffrage owing alone to the tactics of its supporters. But not relying upon this, the good and true women promptly organized for the defense so forced upon them, and with but very slender funds and few speakers, waged a remarkable campaign, resulting in a glorious rout and disaster of the suffragists who "combed" the State with their agents, speakers, etc. The election returns come in very slowly in this State, and it will be, perhaps, a week or more before the actual vote for President even is accurately known, and longer still until the minor polls are ascertained. *The majority against suffrage is very large, some claim three to one!* It was a brave fight and a glorious victory won by a few women and men representing, perhaps, 80 per cent. of both sexes in the State. To Mrs. Dodge, Mrs. Oliphant [the Joan of Arc of the combat], Miss Dorman, Miss Bronson, Miss Price and Miss Markeson are due the everlasting gratitude of our good women, who contended so bravely against such odds of money, emissaries and such outrageous methods.

SOUTH DAKOTA

By Mrs. E. Jacobsen
Secretary, South Dakota Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

(ONE SMALL COUNTY MISSING)

Against Suffrage	57,702
For Suffrage	52,107
Anti-Suffrage Majority	5,595

ONCE again we have demonstrated the truth of our slogan, "Where we work we win."

As the majority against woman suffrage piles up in South Dakota, we are convinced that the crest of the suffrage wave is passed and the future looks easy to the women who are standing so firmly for the integrity of our nation and the real rights of women.

The South Dakota campaign was one of the bitterest ever waged by the suffrage advocates. They also resorted to the usual misrepresentations. In June the suffragists announced that they had made a canvass of the women of the State and that 90 per cent. of them were in favor of suffrage. When challenged by the anti-suffrage association of the State to prove their claim, the suffragists gave out some figures covering a few counties in the State. Beadle county was the banner registration. Here they joyously claimed to have secured 1,296 names, but Beadle county has more than 4,300 women of voting age. In Minnehaha county they claimed 2,000 women, but Minnehaha County had over 10,000 women of voting age. In spite of these discrepancies in figures they reiterated in the press and on the platform that 90 per cent. of the women of South Dakota were asking for the ballot.

The liquor charges constantly made by the suffragists were refuted by the people on election day. The chief support of the *suffragists* was found in the wettest districts of the State.

Deadwood and Lead, *the wettest towns* in South Dakota under local option, proved to be the *strongholds* of the *suffrage cause*. The Anti-Saloon League of South Dakota published in a South Dakota edition of *The New Republic* that under the license system, Deadwood had six saloons and twice as many speakeasies. Of the eleven speakeasies in Deadwood paying an internal revenue tax, six are owned and conducted by women, according to the secretary of the Anti-Saloon League of South Dakota. Deadwood gave a large majority *for suffrage*, and Lead, where similar moral conditions prevail, gave even a larger majority for votes for women. Pierre, a "dry" town under local option, defeated suffrage. The returns would indicate that the liquor interests in South Dakota *were not opposed* to woman suffrage, but *were in favor of it*.

The mining interests of Lawrence County also were strongly in favor of woman suffrage, and the superintendent of the Homestake Mine, owned by the Hearsts, was president of the Men's League for Woman Suffrage. The opposition of the Hearst interests *to prohibition* is as well known as their approval of votes for women.

The suffrage speakers, by their bitter and malignant personal attacks on the anti-suffragists, by their militancy and unfair methods of campaigning, proved potent forces in the defeat of the cause they advocated. Aguments were entirely abandoned for personal abuse, and the fair-minded citizens of South Dakota have rebuked such methods and such abuse by giving a good, substantial majority against woman suffrage.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, in the *August issue*, page 8, estimated the number of votes cast in the double suffrage States *almost exactly*. Incomplete returns show 4,852,568 votes in these States for the chief candidates. The Protest estimate was 4,882,949!

The women, it is estimated, cast 1,818,723 votes.

For a complete statistical analysis of the election, and a striking article on "Women After the War," order your December Protest, the CONVENTION NUMBER, in advance. Better turn to the blank on the back cover, subscribe and be sure of getting all the up-to-date information on this subject.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City.

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. B. Glover.....Fairfield, Conn.
Treasurer, Miss Caroline W. Stewart..Glen Ridge, N. J.

Vol. X November, 1916 No. 1

206

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

THE returns indicate that the women's vote in the Western States was practically identical with that of the men of their families. This is most impressively shown in Illinois, the only State where the votes of men and women are counted separately.

Had women not voted the result of the election would have been the same—at less expense to the people and with less bother to the women.

The evidence shows that suffragists were not able to "deliver" the women's vote anywhere to the candidate they favored. "Sex solidarity" in this election has been proved a myth, as the anti-suffragists prophesied it would.

The so-called "Woman's Party" failed completely to make good its claims with the women voters. It failed absolutely to carry out the purpose for which it was organized—to defeat the Democratic candidate in the States where women vote.

It had no effect whatever upon the election—unless its methods were responsible for the fact that the man it was organized to defeat carried the State of its birthplace, Colorado, the State of its militant president, Nevada, and most of the other States in which it was active.

Western women voters have shown no preference for a candidate who favored the Federal suffrage amendment.

The war-cry of the Woman's Party against the President, "He Kept Us Out of Suffrage," did not influence the women voters. No astute politician hereafter can be bluffed or threatened by the alleged "women's vote." There is no such commodity for anybody to "deliver."

One peculiarity has been noticed in Illinois, which may also obtain elsewhere. In many Republican districts the women were more Republican than the men. In many Democratic districts the women were more Democratic than the men. This would seem to indicate a more intense partisanship, where it exists, among the women voters, but no general party preference.

The woman in politics, and the woman trying to get into politics have contributed nothing to politics but increased election costs, more expensive and spectacular stunts, more bitter partisanship and bigger bluffs than the men have made.

The dignity, power and status of woman in public life have not been elevated. Politics has not been purified. The exhibit at this election shows suffrage is an expensive experiment to the State, and a burden of no benefit to women.

THE REJECTION OF MISREPRESENTATION

THE overwhelming victory over double suffrage in West Virginia shows what the anti-suffragists can do when they get a fair hearing. This we had in West Virginia, especially after one of our speakers vanquished the leader of all the suffragists in an open debate before a party convention.

But it was a hard fight, and one in which every political weapon was used against us without scruple. Our women were publicly attacked by name wherever they went, and when the papers refused to print three-year-old misrepresentations about them which had been denied and refuted hundreds of times, these attacks were inserted as paid advertising. In some places, suffragists were able to stir up so much prejudice that a few newspapers would not even accept anti-suffrage advertisements, and would not even publish answers by anti-suffragists to vicious and personal attacks.

These methods did not appeal to the people of West Virginia. They repudiated them decisively at the polls. In one county where the suffragists tried to break up an anti-suffrage meeting, the voters decided by *ten to one* that this sort of politics should not be made permanent in West Virginia.

In South Dakota, the same methods were used, even more ruthlessly, and the voters there also repudiated them.

There would be no reason for mentioning these things at this time were it not for the hope that it may convince the suffragists that they would gain more if they waged a clean campaign, worthy of the dignity of American women.

When suffragists do not conduct a fair campaign *for* the vote, how do they expect anyone to believe they could conduct a fair campaign *with* the vote? The people rightly judge future dangers from present methods and a cause by the actions of its advocates.

WHERE WOMEN PLAY THE GAME

THE Miriams, the Lilians, the Alices and Anns
Have sought to reconstruct the world according to their plans.
They claimed that women would uplift and dignify our laws,
But deeds are more than promises and reason bids us pause.
That some believed the vows they made and gave them voting power
Has furnished to the rest of us this most instructive hour.
This last election, pregnant with its clear outstanding facts,
Has proven, when in politics, just how a woman acts.
We saw campaigners on their trips the butt of common jeers,
Insulted, heckled, hooted with their faces drenched in tears.
They vowed to stand together for the "rights" they meant to claim,
But now we know the sad results when women play the game.
These insults came—not from the men, whom they had chanced to vex—
But from opposing factions of their own and gentler sex.
We saw them turn to tactics that mere man had cast aside
Long ages back as petty and as too undignified.
We saw enough to wring our hearts, to blush our cheeks with shame;
We saw these things in suffrage States where women play the game.

—*Florence Goff Schwarz.*

MILITANT METHODS IN ACTION

THE plain facts illustrate the methods suffragists are introducing into politics. The following stories of the experiences of a leading anti-suffrage speaker in West Virginia need no comment:

At Beckley, W. Va., an anti-suffrage meeting was arranged for eight o'clock on November 2d, at the court house. The suffragists, headed by their so-called "flying squadron" and led by one of their national officers, demanded that the court house be refused to the anti-suffrage speaker. When this demand was not complied with they requested the sheriff to stop the anti-suffrage meeting at nine o'clock and allow the suffragists to have the court house. This demand also was refused. Yet even the handbills announcing the anti-suffrage meeting, which were in the office of a prominent attorney, were stolen to stop it.

None of these efforts availing, shortly before nine o'clock the suffragists entered the hall, and urged men to interrupt the speaker. Finally a very tall man rose and stood directly in front of Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, the anti-suffrage speaker, and while she was speaking announced that there would be a suffrage meeting in another place at nine-thirty. Another man brought up hastily-made suffrage signs, and attempted to place them on the platform while the anti-suffragist was speaking.

"Throw him out," roared the audience. He was removed by the sheriff. Thereupon Mrs. Oliphant reminded the audience that Democrats and Republicans never tried to break up each other's meetings in this fashion, and asked if they had ever known the antis to interfere with a suffrage meeting. Cries of "No! No!" sounded over the hall. A gentleman of great local prominence then arose and said:

"Mrs. Oliphant, I ask you to let me make an announcement. I had intended to vote in favor of woman suffrage, but the discourteous treatment of women exhibited here tonight leads me to announce that now I shall vote against woman suffrage." He was vigorously applauded. At nine-thirty, Mrs. Oliphant asked those who wished to attend the suffrage meting to go out as quietly as possible. Only fifteen women and ten men left the hall, thereby allowing those who had been standing to be seated.

After the meeting leading citizens of the town, including a minister, apologized to the anti-suffrage speaker on behalf of the town, and stated that nothing of that sort had ever occurred there before. Over fifty men announced that it had changed their votes. The tall man who first disturbed the anti-suffrage speaker was the principal of one of the leading preparatory institutes of the town. A prominent lawyer said of him: "I shall never allow my children to be taught by a man who would show such discourtesy to a woman in public." It is to be remembered that neither this man, nor the national officer of the suffragists offered any excuse or apology for the incident.

A few days later, at Welch, W. Va., another anti-suffrage meeting was arranged for eight o'clock in the county court house. At twenty minutes to eight the crowd was filing into the hall. At ten minutes to eight the electric light wires were cut, leaving the court house in darkness—the only building in the town so affected. The nearest electrician was six miles away. Undaunted, a local woman in sympathy with the antis suggested candles. An audience of more than four hundred persons sat in the dark and heard the anti-suffrage speaker, who addressed them from the judge's desk, surrounded by a halo of candles, until nine forty-five, when the lights were fixed.

At Montgomery, charges that the anti-suffrage speaker was paid by the liquor interests had been so industriously circulated that she was asked to mention them in her speech. She did. She issued a challenge to the suffragists, a group of whom had come in with their yellow sashes and taken the front seats.

"I challenge any man or woman in this audience to come up here and prove that I am paid by liquor interests," the speaker said. "There is not enough money in the United States to hire me to speak for any liquor interest." No one accepted the challenge.

"Will any one of these suffragists who have been circulating this story rise?" she asked. One woman in a yellow sash, a local leader, rose.

"Now tell the audience what proof you have," the speaker said.

"I—ah—haven't any proof," the woman replied.

"Then why do you circulate these stories?" she was asked.

"Well, we—ah—know it as well as we know there are blind tigers!"

"This is a sample of suffrage methods," resumed the speaker. "Now, I want to issue another challenge I have been making in West Virginia for eight weeks, which no one has taken up. The suffragists say the liquor interests are their only opponents. It is only a few days till election. If the liquor interests are opposing woman suffrage in this State they ought to be busy by this time. Is there any man or woman in this audience who knows of a representative of the liquor interests in this State who is working to defeat the suffrage amendment? Will he or she come up to the platform and tell this audience where this liquor representative is working, and what he or she is doing against woman suffrage?" No one offered to accept the challenge, and the meeting went on successfully. Afterwards a prominent man remarked:

"No wonder the anti-suffrage associations need so few speakers. This woman has torn down in fifty-two minutes all the arguments the suffragists built up in fifty-two weeks!"

MILITANT tactics in South Dakota were even more marked than in West Virginia. Unwilling to engage in dignified debate or fair discussion of the issues involved, the suffragists followed up the most sensational liquor charges in the press with unseemly demonstrations at anti-suffrage meetings, and then sent out lurid accounts of these experiences.

Mrs. Elsie Benedict, a suffragist street speaker from Colorado, followed the anti-suffrage speakers about and attempted to prevent anti-suffrage meetings by attracting crowds on the streets in front of the halls engaged. When these attempts proved of no avail, Mrs. Benedict would lead her cohorts into the meeting with suffrage banners and much noise and shuffling of feet and try to annoy the speaker.

At Brookings, when told by the theater manager to leave her banners outside, Mrs. Benedict remonstrated and attempted forcibly to enter with them. When restrained, she charged the theater manager, striking him in the face and calling him names. Finally she managed to get into the meeting and ran down the aisle dancing back and forth with a banner.

"Did you ask that man to prevent me from coming into this hall?" she demanded.

"No," answered the anti-suffrage speaker, Miss Minnie Bronson.

"Well, he said you did, and it was because he took my banner away that I had to run down here and wave and disturb your meeting."

"That is surely a logical reason," Miss Bronson replied. "You were prevented from disturbing the meeting in one way, so you had to do it in another. I am glad the proprietor enforced his rule."

After the meeting, Mrs. Benedict told how a "hired henchman" of the antis had assaulted her, and went to Watertown, where she told the chief of police that Miss Bronson had "hired a thug" and gave out a newspaper interview that she had been "pushed, struck and kicked" by this man. The Chief of Police immediately communicated with the Chief of Police of Brookings, who was present

during the incident. The manager of the theater, Mr. E. H. Carlisle, who was *a suffragist*, and who has voted for the amendment at all previous elections, and for the prohibition party since 1888, and who is well known as a gentleman after a residence of twenty-eight years in South Dakota, was the man accused. Mr. Carlisle, in his signed statement, which is also signed by Mr. Nels Gulick, Chief of Police, and Mr. William M. Holmes, Assistant Chief of Police, as "a fair statement of the facts," says in part:

"Being the manager of the opera house in question, and having leased the same for the evening for the use of the anti-suffrage speakers, Miss Bronson and Mrs. Jacobsen, I was at the box office and entrance looking after the seating and handling of the people. The meeting was under way and the speaking had been going on for some time without incident, when a number of persons came from a suffrage meeting which was being conducted by Mrs. Benedict on the street more than a block away. Most of the people were carrying suffrage pennants and banners on sticks, which I considered would be a disturbance to the meeting and an annoyance to the speakers, and considering myself, as manager of the house, responsible for the good order of the meeting, I requested these people to leave their banners at the box office until after the meeting. They complied without protest until Mrs. Benedict, with her immediate followers, numbering probably fifteen or twenty persons, came to the door. I requested these people, as I had those already in the hall, to leave pennants and banners outside. Mrs. Benedict, in a loud and boisterous tone and manner refused to do this and defied me to attempt to stop her entrance to the house with her banner. I respectfully told her that she would be welcome if she would leave her banner outside. She became very angry and abusive, and rushed by me, with her banner, into the door of the auditorium, when I caught her with my arm and took her back to the entrance, she striking me several blows about the head and face with her fists.

"Mrs. Benedict then removed her pennant and entered the auditorium with the others. * * * This constitutes the only and all the physical force that I used upon or against Mrs. Benedict on this occasion. I neither struck nor kicked her, nor attempted such a thing, nor used any discourteous words or action toward her. Her statement in the interview in the *Public Opinion*, above quoted, upon this matter is wholly and absolutely false and can be so proven by a number of eye witnesses to the affair. I would say that the Chief of Police, Mr. Gulick, and his assistant, Mr. Holmes, who were present in the hallway at the time, will substantiate this statement in every material feature." They did, as noted above.

The suffragists subsequently secured a statement signed by other alleged eye-witnesses, who declared that the manager had "seized her [Mrs. Benedict] by the shoulders and violently and roughly restrained her from entering the room." The charge that Mrs. Benedict was "pushed, struck and kicked" is not sustained, even by the statement of these suffragists, as they declare:

"There was no other disturbance outside the door, except that aroused by Mr. Carlisle's forcibly restraining Mrs. Benedict from entering." Naturally, there would have been a marked disturbance had Mrs. Benedict been abused in the manner described in her lurid interview.

At other anti-suffrage gatherings "votes for women" bands were tied on dogs that were turned loose to disturb the meeting. This effort fell quite flat, however, when Miss Bronson smilingly asked if they were "trying suffrage on the dog."

It is believed such methods on the part of the suffragists proved of great benefit to the antis, and largely increased the vote against the amendment.

Newspaper charges were too constant to be mentioned here in detail. One representative of the anti-suffragists had to use legal measures to stop the circulation of abusive and libelous personal attacks, started in a suffrage organ.

SUFFRAGE BY THREAT

[The following letters are significant examples of the methods used by suffragists to coerce and intimidate men and to attack their sister women of opposing opinion. The first letter was written by a suffrage leader to a prominent gentleman who presided at an anti-suffrage meeting. The second was written in reply. Note, in the first letter, the interrogative device in the third paragraph designed to trick the reader into believing that the liquor interests are supporting the antis, although the direct charge is avoided.—EDITOR.]

DEAR SIR:

I am more surprised that *you*, with your opportunities of enlightenment should take so open a stand against the inevitable as to preside at an anti-suffrage meeting. Sane judgment depends upon retrospect and prospect of any step in human progress.

But for the pioneer work done by such as Dr. Anna Shaw, Susan B. Anthony, Frances E. Willard and a score of others, these anti-suffrage speakers would neither be able or have the privilege of doing the very thing they charge as unwomanly in suffragists.

Where are dirtier politics than where the organized liquor power use their money and influence? Who supports these antis? Prove for yourself and then show *us*.

Never was anything more certain than world-wide equal suffrage before your time of usefulness shall have passed, yet you are setting the spring which will close your door of opportunity before you can reach the reasonable degree of success you should hope for.

I promise you a lasting memory of this stand you take (unless publicly repudiated), which will be your future undoing politically.

How you could have known some of the women you have and can listen to a woman of whom you might be ashamed to know villify such as our State president, Mrs. Y., and her associated workers, whom you know to be among the most refined and sincere women of this or any other State, is beyond my comprehension.

If your manly sense of the just and right is not seared beyond repair I hope as you recall this woman's manner and speech you may be enabled to receive again your sight.

YOUR DISAPPOINTED FRIEND OF OTHER DAYS.

THE REPLY

MY DEAR MRS. ——:

Your letter criticizing my attitude toward woman suffrage and the open stand I took in presiding at a meeting addressed by an anti-suffrage speaker has been received, and I feel that in justice to myself and in deference to those of my old friends who, like yourself, hold different views, I should take this opportunity to make my position quite clear regarding this subject.

You say that you are surprised that with my "opportunities for enlightenment" I should take this stand. I wish to say that it is only after making the most of such opportunities as I have had, after carefully studying the different phases of this subject, after observing the result of woman suffrage where it has been tried, and considering its application to the conditions in our own State, that I do take this stand.

I am not in favor of woman suffrage and I thoroughly believe that its adoption would prove not a benefit, but a very distinct loss of the great power and influence for good that is exerted today by women, for women do have an influential part in the making of better laws, and upon all efforts for the betterment of humanity. I say this influence will be lost because to be effective such influence must be *non-political* and *non-partisan* and any *voter* must, of necessity, be affiliated with one party or another, must naturally seek results through one party and ask no support from the opposing party.

It is absurd to suppose that women, if voting, would still maintain a non-partisan attitude of mind. Human nature is the same the world over and man nature and woman nature do not differ greatly.

Suffrage is *not a privilege,* but, when conferred, a duty and a duty which it seems to me unnecessary for women to assume, since, as I believe, by so doing they will not improve political conditions, will, in fact, have nothing to gain but much to lose.

From no point of view can I find any reason to advocate woman suffrage.

I grant you that some very able women have advocated woman suffrage, among them Anna Howard Shaw, a woman of unusual strength of mind and heart. In her very interesting autobiography she tells that from her earliest days she had an overwhelming desire to speak to an audience, to be heard, and even when she entered the ministry she did so, not from altruistic motives, but because of her determination to realize that dominant ambition to be in the public eye, a trait that is characteristic of many suffragists.

It is also true that there are many gifted women opposed to woman suffrage, and it seems to me if the years teach us one thing above all others, it is, tolerance for the opinion of others even though they differ from ours, and I am, therefore, surprised that you should resort to personal attack upon the character of any woman who takes a public stand against woman suffrage. I know women for whom I have the utmost respect who are in favor of it, but it does not follow that those who are opposed to it are unworthy of respect.

Considering the great number of fine women in this country who are opposed to it, among them Miss Boardman, the head of the great Red Cross organization, Mrs. Taft, Mrs. Elihu Root, the former Mrs. Grover Cleveland and many other women who are prominent and active in our national life, and recognizing the fact that these women are back of the anti-suffrage movement and anti-suffrage speakers, it seems little short of ridiculous to insinuate that a woman vouched for by this national organization and financially supported by it, and its representative to the people of West Virginia to present from the platform its views and policies upon a great political question, is of doubtful character or "controlled by the liquor interests," such insinuations are certainly unworthy of you and belittle the cause you wish to champion.

I see no reason why an anti-suffrage speaker should be held in any less esteem than a suffrage speaker, and I might add that no anti-suffrage speaker whom I have heard has resorted to any personal criticism or by manner or speech given offense to any hearer.

It is the most regrettable thing in politics today—the disposition to villify, malign and slander an adversary, and to such an extent has this been carried that a person offering himself as a candidate for any political office may prepare to have all manner of charges laid against him and circulated through the partisan press and proclaimed from every political platform, and this without any regard as to the truth or falsity of such charges. This condition has too often driven the best men of the country out of politics and in many instances opened the door of political opportunity to those who are unworthy and incompetent, and who have, in many instances, no character or reputation to protect. My observation and belief is that women under like circumstances, and associated with men in and for political purposes would not conduct themselves any better than men and might very readily, in the excitement of the campaign, so forget themselves as to vilify and malign the character of even one of their own sex. It is from this condition that I would protect the women of this State.

You suffragists, it seems to me, fail to distinguish between *power* and *influence.* The latter you have. And through your allied organizations are in a position to make that influence felt upon any matter of public concern, whether State or national. That influence is the only organized vital force outside of politics today in this country. Who can deny the strength and force of that influence in obtaining the passage of the Prohibition amendment in this State? The *power* to enforce that law is in the men of the State, but the force and strength of your influence is such as to insure its proper enforcement. I fear that to admit you into equal suffrage would politicalize and demoralize that influence, and that ever after when you sought the advancement of any cause, however meritorious, you would be charged with seeking some political advantage or party expediency.

You refer to the liquor question as though it has some vital connection and influence on the question of equal suffrage. In this I cannot agree with you. If I were to decide this matter alone upon the association and relation of equal suffrage in the States where it has prevailed, and the liquor cause in the same States, I should be forced to the conclusion that the liquor cause has nothing to fear in granting the franchise to women. Consider these facts—that up to 1910 there were ten Prohibition States and every one of them was made so by male suffrage. No State prior to 1910 in which women voted had established prohibition, though the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah and Idaho had had equal suffrage for from fourteen to forty-seven years; and with women voting the prohibition amendment failed in Colorado in 1912 and in California in 1914. Of the nineteen States which now have prohibition, six have equal suffrage, but one of these, Kansas, adopted prohibition thirty years before it adopted equal suffrage, so that of the nineteen States to adopt prohibition fourteen of them passed the amendment with men alone voting and five with the aid of women votes. This record is certainly against your cause and it has been truthfully said, "Man's relation to liquor cannot be changed by changing woman's relation to the State."

You say equal suffrage is inevitable and advise me to repudiate my stand against it in order to save myself politically. Believe me, a political grave has no terrors for me and such a death no sting. Your threats might have some influence upon that class of persons who are today seeking votes and political preferment, but on me, nay, nay.

Now that all the political parties in the State have declared for equal suffrage, and that every candidate from president to constable of all the parties is *profuse* in his declarations of "Votes for women," and you say it is "inevitable," what would be your opinion of the sincerity of the men in politics if this cause, so *unanimously supported* should lack a few thousand votes necessary to secure its adoption? Of course, you would at once reach the conclusion that somebody had played you false. And I think your conclusion would be just right; but how could you place the blame on any particular persons or party? My conclusion is that the worst you could do would be to heap your maledictions upon the heads of those of your *disappointed friends* of *other days* who were frank enough to take an open stand.

Inevitable, you think? Let us look at the facts for a moment.

New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania voted against this amendment in 1915, Iowa in 1916, Nebraska, Missouri, North Dakota and South Dakota in 1914, Ohio in 1912 and again in 1914, with an increased majority; Michigan in 1912 and again in 1913, with an increased majority; Wisconsin in 1912.

I do not believe it to be inevitable, but even so, it apparently does not occur to you that I might be sincere in my opinion on the subject, or that a matter of principle might be involved, but you advise me to get on the popular side, as so many politicians are trying to do, is that, in fact, the sort of political ideal you would uphold?

I cannot abandon my belief and adopt your faith even under promise of your future political support. I only ask that you accredit those who differ from you with the same sincere and honest motives which you, yourself, assume to possess.

Most respectfully and sincerely yours,

———— ————.

ANOTHER DANGER DEMONSTRATED

THE recent campaign has demonstrated a danger in woman suffrage which even the strongest opponents of the "cause" have not predicted: the deplorable partisan battles between women, and men and women, which have recently taken place in the West. Women have been ridiculed, hissed, heckled and attacked in the most shameless manner. Epithets of a personal and insulting nature have appeared on banners and caused near-riots. Their clothes and their husbands, instead of their arguments, have been criticized. This sort of thing is creating a situation of serious menace to the status of woman.

The explanation is simple, and is based on differences between the sexes which cannot be changed without injury to both. Women are naturally more quiet and courteous than men—or perhaps it is their training, and the fact that they have hitherto been respected as non-combatants in man's wars and man's politics. The political woman, however, instinctively aware that men usually treat her sex with courtesy is tempted to abuse her privileges and to strain man's courtesy to the breaking point. Beyond that the man refuses to show her proper consideration, and not only forgets that she is a woman, but applies epithets and personalities to her which he would not ordinarily apply to men. Of course, instances of this kind are infrequent enough to be called isolated, as yet, but the recent campaign has shown a tendency to increase them.

It matters not whether the women were suffragists, anti-suffragists, Democrats or Republicans. The point is that *they are women*, and women have never been treated with such discourtesy before nor in the States where women do not vote.

We give below the most significant news and comment from the press:

(Chicago *Tribune*, Republican and Pro-Suffrage)
November 2, 1916

In all the seventy-odd towns in which meetings have been held the women have never been so rudely handled as they were in Chicago this morning. The Portland episode is a pleasant memory compared to the reception which some Wilson partisans in Chicago gave them.

The demonstration which awaited the train when it passed through Chicago four weeks ago was confined to banners and the setting off of a black smudge. Today's demonstration was nothing so dignified as that.

Crowds Grow Riotous

It was planned to have street meetings in various parts of the city. Many of those meetings could not be held because hostile crowds of Wilsonites became riotous. The one which was planned for Congress and State streets had to be abandoned altogether. On the corner of Madison and Dearborn streets traffic was blocked by the crowds which gathered around a motor car from which two of the women of the train were speaking, and there was so much heckling that the meeting had to be abandoned.

In Cohan's Grand Opera House a meeting was held which threatened to become a riot. The gallery was filled with hoodlums who rah-rahed for Wilson and stamped and shouted opprobious epithets at the speakers.

They made it so unpleasant for Mrs. Nelson O'Shaughnessy that she said, "I have never spoken in Chicago before," probably with the intention of saying she never wanted to again, when a voice called out, "Oh, yes, you have. You said on the corner of Madison and Halstead the last time you were here that we were all ignorant. We're not a bunch of millionaires in Chicago."

Silences the Hecklers

Finally Mrs. Raymond Robins said that none was forced to listen to the speech if he didn't care to and that if he didn't he had better go. That quieted the audience in the theater, but outside there was pandemonium. A group of young men was the nucleus of a shifting mob of men who shouted "Wilson," "Wilson," and set the crowd off into merriment by revilings of Mr. Hughes and the women's train in general.

The meeting inside the theater was composed mostly of men. A few women from the Democratic party were outside distributing pamphlets written by Mrs. George Bass.

A machine with flags on the headlights and a banner with the legend, "The Women's Campaign Train for Hughes," was waiting for the speakers to take them back to the train, which left at 1:15. When the speakers walked out to it hoodlums tore off the banners, shouted at the women, and threatened to keep the machine from moving.

Woman Driver Assaulted

While she was trying to get through the crowd the driver heard herself called a traitor to her sex and a frenzied woman rushed up and literally spat in her face.

(New York *World*, Democratic and Pro-Suffrage)
November 2, 1916

Only a small audience, chiefly men, was sprinkled over Cohan's Grand Opera House under the vigilant eyes of half a dozen policemen when Mrs. Nelson O'Shaughnessy rose to open the meeting shortly before noon. More drifted in later, until the crowd downstairs was all the police could handle and the doors were closed to new arrivals.

"I am for Charles Evans Hughes," began Mrs. O'Shaughnessy, when she was interrupted by "And we're for Wilson!" shouted by a large part of the audience. A few minutes later a woman stepped out into the lobby and called "Wilson! Wilson!" which was the signal for prolonged applause within.

When the speaker asked if there were questions from the audience a man at the front demanded to know, if Wilson's Mexican policy were all wrong, what substitute by Mr. Hughes had she to offer. She started on another point until cries of "Answer the question" made her stop. Then she said that what had been done in Mexico was no concern of Mr. Hughes's and would not be until after March 4th. The crowd greeted her reply with jeers and loud laughter.

At one time it looked as though there would be a free-for-all fight in the audience between the hecklers and representatives of Republican clubs, who were trying to keep order and who begged the objectors to give the women a fair deal.

Outside the theater a mob was yelling itself hoarse for Wilson and Democratic literature was scattered broadcast.

Eggs were tossed at the women and they left the theater by an alley exit and passed into waiting automobiles, but none of them struck the women or the machines.

(Augusta, Me., *Journal*, Republican and Pro-Suffrage)
October 24, 1916

The attack upon the Woman's Party banner bearers in front of the Auditorium and Congress hotels, Chicago, last Thursday, is vividly described by a Maine woman who was present and attacked by the Democratic thugs. We give her own words and also a photo of the group taken shortly before President Wilson's arrival at the Auditorium.

One hundred women representing the Woman's Party met at headquarters and were supplied with banners and insignia and marched informally to the corner of Michigan Boulevard and Congress street near the Auditorium building where President Wilson was to speak. There we stood, lined up on either side, our banners turned toward the crowd, and waited for the President to appear.

The protest was a silent one; we were told at headquarters not to enter any argument. Our banners told the story of the record of the Democratic party upon women suffrage. Many sympathizers came up to assure us of their good will, some of

the rougher element attempted to heckle us, but it was not till the President entered the Auditorium and the crowd began to disperse that there was any real disturbance.

Across the street from where I stood a man snatched a banner from a woman and trampled it in the dirt. On our side of the street a woman took her umbrella and careless of whom she hit, rammed it through one of the banners. Her child by her side screamed and the place became pandemonium. Two men seized the banner I held with Mrs. Bertram Sippy, third chairman of the Congressional Union, and dragged it from us, fighting their way out to the street. Other men seized the other banners. If the women resisted they were slatted about till their hands were shaken off, or pounded on their knuckles till they gave up. Some of the women had their clothes torn. One elderly woman was dragged half-way across the street.

POLICE ONLY LAUGHED

The police did not attempt to quell the riot. I appealed to a mounted policeman and he laughed. As we walked to headquarters lots of young men entered the mob which, shouting and hooting, followed us to headquarters, where they stood outside the building and continued their demonstrations of malediction.

The Congressional Union women were dignified and fearless. Only one showed any resentment. She was a foreigner and fought back with her umbrella and her fists. I said to her, "Don't you know you are hurting the cause?" but she was too angry to heed me. One of the ladies found herself separated from the women and in the center of the mob. The men began to tug at her regalia and she made no attempt to withdraw, but facing them stood silent. She is a very lovely looking woman and the effect was instantaneous. The crowd separated and six or eight men formed a circle about her. "Let her go, men," one man said, "She's a perfect lady."

It appears that a "perfect lady" is still respected, according to this suffragist's testimony—a rather remarkable clue to an understanding of these political riots.

(New York *Times*, Independent and Anti-Suffrage)
November 6, 1916

It may be, of course, that the women who have been campaigning about the country in behalf of Mr. Hughes are right in claiming that they have had an appreciable influence in his favor on the result of the election. Whether they have or not is a matter of assertion, not of proof, and the question as to the amount and nature of their efficiency as vote-getters can be answered about as safely one way as another. Probably, however, even the most ardent admirers of these courageous itinerants do not think that their efforts were decisive—"turned the scale," as the saying is—nor would they be sure of it even if tomorrow's decision were by the narrowest of margins a success for Mr. Hughes.

On the other hand, people for whom this sort of participation in politics by women is displeasing cannot be refuted, whatever the event, if they insist that the feminine orators did more harm than good for the cause they advocated. Yet the case of the campaigners is not made up wholly of uncertainties.

It is obvious, for one thing, that the interest they excited was not in what they said, but in the fact that they said anything. If they expected to have their arguments weighed or their emotional appeals heeded as are those of other "spellbinders," they must have been disappointed. They are intelligent and well-informed women, and their speeches, presumably, as speeches, were above rather than below the not very high standard of public oratory in political contests. But few people, if any, paid real attention to what they said, and though the newspapers in the towns where they went gave them a good deal of space, no attempt was made anywhere to give even the substance of their speeches. That was unfair and a ground of reasonable complaint, but it was inevitable.

And inevitable, too, was it that, detestable as were the discourtesies to which these women were subjected in many places, a good deal of the resentment thereby excited in decent people, by a queer but familiar psychological process, was transferred from the guilty to the innocent—that is, to the victims of the mean little outrages that were committed. We feel, somehow, that women should not invite insult or unnecessarily expose themselves to it, and that when they do we have a just grievance against them.

(St. Paul, Minn., *Times*)
November 4, 1916

Eggs of uncertain age met women participants in politics in Chicago Thursday afternoon, according to the daily press. This is the condition of things which anti-suffragists have seen from the beginning. * * * It is not a spectacle to be proud of that women put themselves in a position where men and other women inflamed by political excitement so far forget themselves as to do such things. The dignity of womanhood is not elevated, nor is her influence for good enhanced by putting herself in a place to invite such treatment.

A MANLY MINISTER

ALL men do not take kindly to suffrage threats. Sometimes such methods have startling results

Dr. S. W. Walker is pastor of the Johnson Memorial Methodist Church, Huntington, W. Va., and teacher of the largest Men's Bible Class in the world.

Although an anti-suffragist, Dr. Walker had taken no public stand on the question. The suffragists threatened, if he did, to break up his Bible class. He thereupon gave the following statement to the West Virginia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage:

I believe the intelligence of woman is equal to that of man; that giving her the ballot would help politics in some measure, but after my observation of suffrage in California I am convinced that we lose more in woman than we gain in the voter."

(Signed) S. W. WALKER.

In his sermon of October 29th, Dr. Walker said:

"A leader of the suffragists in Huntington told a leading lawyer, who was a prominent worker in the Men's Bible Class, that she was doing everything in her power to break up the Bible class.

"Hell is full of such people," concluded Dr. Walker.

A SLOW SUICIDE

THE serpent of Suffrage, with its ill-concealed fangs of Feminism, which has been tempting the women of America to eat the apple of domestic discord and give up their present privileges for the knowledge of political evil, is showing an old serpentine trait. It is slowly stinging itself to death, as the following quotations indicate:

"The Congressional Union has done more harm to the cause of woman suffrage than all the anti-suffrage organizations combined. They have made all the Democratic women of the West furious. They have angered old friends of suffrage like Senator Thomas and Senator Shafroth of Colorado."
—DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW.

(Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin*, Sept. 11th.)

Speaking of the work of the Woman's Party (the Congressional Union's beloved first-born), Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, says:

"The figures in the West indicate a disloyalty of the women to the Federal suffrage amendment in that section since practically every man favors the Federal amendment. It does mean an extreme resentment that the Eastern women should go out there and tell them how to vote."

(New York *World*, November 9th.)

WHAT REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT MEANS

IF democracy is to survive, there is need in this country today for clear-cut definitions of representative government. A few days ago a candidate for Congress stated that he might vote for the Federal suffrage amendment in spite of the expressed opposition of the overwhelming majority of the people in his district. He declared that there was much to be said as to whether a representative was bound to follow the wishes of his constituents. In the course of his speech he also asserted that the Federal amendment is virtually submitted to the people, even if they get no chance to vote directly upon it, as they elect the legislators and Congressmen who do vote on it. An anti-suffrage speaker replied:

"But representatives do not always represent their districts, Mr. ——. You do not mean to represent yours."

The remark drew a laugh at the gentleman's expense, but it is worthy of serious consideration. If representative government means anything, *it means what it says.* How is the representative chosen? By the superior wisdom of one man? He is not. He is chosen by the majority vote of the electors in his district. He owes his election absolutely to the principle of majority rule. He goes into office through that principle. He takes his oath as a representative of that principle. And if that principle is sound enough to decide the man who shall serve as representative, it is sound enough to decide the measures which shall represent that district. The old, autocratic idea that the people can be trusted to elect their own leaders, but not to decide their own fundamental laws, has no place in a republic. Practically every State in the Union has admitted this principle by referring the fundamental law—its constitution—to the entire electorate whenever an amendment or a new constitution is proposed. The framers of our constitution called majority rule "the first principle of a republic," and we have recognized it as the just and legal form of deciding every elective office and of ratifying the provisions of nearly every State constitution in America.

The proposed Federal suffrage amendment is a deliberate attempt to evade this principle, and to have our fundamental laws changed at the orders of a small aristocracy of agitators, juggling the Federal Constitution to circumvent the will of the majority of both men and women.

When the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1787, its makers intended it as a safeguard against just such an effort. The proposal was made that the Constitution should not be amended unless the majority of the States ratifying it should also represent *a majority of the inhabitants of the United States.* But our forefathers were even more zealous in their attempts to preserve the principle of majority rule, and provided what they deemed even a more adequate safeguard in the provision that no amendment should be ratified without the consent of three-quarters of the number of States. At that time this meant, and was intended to mean, that the fundamental Federal law should be decided by States representing not less than three-quarters of the inhabitants of the United States. No one dreamed that in the course of the country's development there would come a time when thirty-six States contain a minority of the people and when twelve States represent the majority, as is the case today. One hundred and twenty-nine years of growth made the Federal amendment provision a menace to the very principle it was designed to preserve. The suffragists and the misrepresentatives who attempt to use this provision to force woman suffrage upon States that have overwhelmingly defeated it through the votes of the majority of men, and in answer to the voice of the majority of women seek to overthrow not only State rights and the right to local self-government, but to reverse the first principles of our republic, and to slay the spirit of democracy for which they pretend to plead.

These efforts, however, cannot prevail. The majority of the men who are sent to Congress will act as true representatives of their districts on this question. In spite of long lists of alleged indorsements of the Federal amendment by candidates, the suffragists know that the recent elections have greatly weakened their cause in Congress. Even strong suffragists who are members of that body have admitted their recognition of the representative opinion in their districts. A New York gentlemen on a Congressional committee before which the president of the National Woman Suffrage Association was speaking last winter, said:

"You know I am a suffragist. As a citizen I voted for it. But my constituents voted 'no.' Now, isn't it my duty as their representative to represent them on a matter on which they have expressed themselves?"

The suffrage president answered "No!"—but every man and woman who believes in representative government knows that *the real representative represents majority opinion during his term of office,* just as he represents majority opinion *on the day he is elected.*

A DISTINCT POLITICAL ISSUE

By Miss Mary G. Kilbreth
Chairman Congressional Committee, New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

THE form of decision by which the question of woman suffrage shall be settled, whether by Federal or State action, is a clear-cut political issue distinct from the question of suffrage. Anti-suffragists insist that the two issues be not confused.

We maintain that this is in no sense a party question, since the two great political parties are in official agreement, having practically identical platforms favoring decision by States.

Neither is it wholly a suffrage question, since suffragists themselves are not unanimous in its favor. Belief in suffrage and advocacy of a Federal amendment are not identical. To cite two conspicuous examples: The New York *World,* Democratic and pro-suffrage, calls it "a vicious political undertaking" (August 5th) and denounces it in several bitter editorials.

Senator Borah of Idaho, Republican, said in the United States Senate: "I have been an advocate of woman suffrage for twenty-five years and am still a believer in the cause. I have been an opponent of the so-called Anthony amendment, and am still so, and expect to remain so until the close of my political career." (Congressional Record, August 21, 1916.)

Anti-suffragists have a double campaign program: first, to bring home to the voters that the purpose of resort to a Federal amendment in this particular case, and the purpose of all lobbies in general, is to outwit him and reverse his decision at the polls; second, to insist that the Federal amendment be discussed on its merits and not confused with other issues.

Anti-suffragists do not attack the existing law in regard to amending the Constitution of the United States as our opponents claim; but we attack the present application of that law. We contend that the question of woman suffrage has been thoroughly discussed, duly submitted to the people and rejected; and that resort to a Federal amendment immediately following this defeat can be interpreted in no other way than as a deliberate attempt to outwit the people and reverse the decision of the majority.

We refuse to allow the woman suffrage question to be projected into our Congressional campaign, and insist that it is not suffrage we are opposing at Washington but abuse of State right and majority rule—two fundamental principles of our government.

We are prepared to meet the straight suffrage issue in our State campaigns against an amendment to the State Constitution, but the two campaigns are separate and distinct.

WHY WE OPPOSE THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT

(From *The New Republic*, October 21, 1916)

SIR: You say in a recent editorial that anti-suffragists seem greatly disturbed at Mr. Hughes' endorsement of a Federal suffrage amendment. They are, and for the best and simplest of reasons.

Such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States would make woman suffrage universal throughout the country without giving the people an opportunity to vote upon it. If the legislatures of thirty-six of the smaller and more sparsely settled States will endorse the amendment, woman suffrage can be forced upon the millions of people in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, where suffrage has recently been defeated by big majorities.

Why have the suffragists resorted to this method, which so obviously controverts the will of the people? Simply because it is their last hope. They have failed utterly to convince the women of the country of the desirability of entering politics. On the only occasion on which a State referendum of the women has been taken on woman suffrage, in Massachusetts in 1895, only four per cent. of the women voted in favor. The suffragist leaders of Massachusetts admit that this set back their cause twenty-five years! Since that time suffragists everywhere strenuously oppose allowing the women to vote on this question. Christabel Pankhurst frankly admitted that a referendum to the women would be a dose of cold poison to the cause.

The suffragists have also failed utterly to convince the men of the country that it is desirable to have women enter politics. Susan B. Anthony, in her address of February, 1884, appealed for a Federal amendment, on the ground that the majority of the voters of the country were against woman suffrage and should not be given a chance to decide the question!

The average man votes against woman suffrage because he finds the average woman has no use for it, and in consequence suffrage is defeated by big majorities in State after State. The only way to dodge this difficulty is to resort to a Federal amendment, which necessitates merely the winning of Congress and thirty-six legislatures. For this nothing is necessary, apparently, but plenty of money and a strong lobby. A Congressman or State legislator must vote in the open and thereby expose himself to the threatened revenge of the suffragists. That he can generally be "influenced" is shown by the action of the New York legislature in passing a suffrage bill at the very first session after the voters of New York had defeated woman suffrage by 200,000. The voters, who pass their verdict in the privacy of the voting booth are beyond the reach of the suffrage lobby. Since the anti-suffrage victory in Iowa, following so soon upon the anti-suffrage victories in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, suffrage leaders frankly admit the hopelessness of winning the people to their side. Indeed many of them declare that it is an "insult" to their dignity that the voters should be allowed to decide this question!

What their increased advocacy of the Federal amendment means is that they have ceased to appeal to the people, and are relying on the politicians to do their bidding. With unlimited money and constant threats they hope to carry their point. We have thus the amazing spectacle of a handful of suffrage lobbyists "holding up" a presidential candidate with the demand: "Deliver over to us the freedom of millions of voters in twelve States to settle this question for themselves, or we will defeat you!" To this demand Mr. Hughes has yielded amid the wild applause of the radicals. It is truly an entertaining and an edifying sight to see these same radicals, who in general proclaim themselves as ardent "friends of the people," rejoicing over a proposal to take away from the people the power to decide this most important question in order that the politicians may decide it *against the people's will!*

Cambridge, Mass. M. R.

THE suffragists, with their war chest of several million dollars controlled by less than half a dozen women, prefer the Federal suffrage amendment for a simple, sordid reason that a man-made corporation seeking a franchise in spite of the people would be ashamed to frame into language.

The Woman Voter, official organ of the suffragists, in its November issue, page 13, says:

"Legislatures are more sensitive politically to party dictation, party political debts and business interests than are the voters."

This statement should show every friend of democracy in this country where the suffragists stand. It is in a class with the alleged remark of an old corporation head: "To ——— with the people."

A FEW FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

THE arguments against woman suffrage are practically limitless. They may be divided, however, into three great divisions: biological, social and political. The biologist knows that woman is different from man, and motherhood a more prolonged and more serious function than fatherhood from a physiological viewpoint. He knows that the good of childhood and civilization requires special protection of the person of the mother from hard labor, undue excitement, and strenuous contest; that civilized races advance in direct proportion to the extent of this protection to their women.

The social student knows that the family, not the individual, is the unit of society, as only the family can reproduce society, and for the maintenance of the family it is necessary that there be a division of labor between the sexes, each contributing that which he or she can do best for the advancement of their common interest, just as partners in any other enterprise.

The woman who makes the home contributes more than the man who makes the laws.

She creates from childhood the character that is honest, just and generous; the code of conduct which obeys laws, written and unwritten, out of internal respect for the rights of others. This is a nobler work than that of framing laws on the statute books to restrain or punish by outside force those who lack the internal virtues of good citizens. Her work is constructive in the greatest sense of the word, while the work of the voter, the legislator, the governor, the judge, the soldier, the sheriff, the warden and the policeman is protective.

Even the honor, integrity and efficiency of these public servants are largely the product of her training. On the mother depends the vital balance between the forces of good and evil. Good government is only possible where she succeeds in making the majority of men good citizens. No nation can rise higher than the character of manhood she inspires. Laws protect public ideals and customs, as patents protect private ideas and inventions, but the law no more creates public morality than the patent creates inventive genius.

The social student who studies the subject seriously must conclude that it is better, on the whole, for woman to concentrate on the creative rather than the protective part in government.

Politically, however, the anti-suffrage argument is indisputable. Just as law and order depend on the ability of the law-abiding majority to restrain the law-breaking minority, politics and gov-

ernment all along the line depend on the will of the majority. It is this law we recognize in electing our governors, legislators and other representatives, because it is the only method by which we can approximate the will of the people. The right of the majority of men to determine the sort of representatives they want in government is unquestioned. The right of the majority of women to determine the sort of representatives they want in government should also be unquestioned, and if the majority of women prefer *manhood* representation, in the persons of their husbands, fathers, sons and brothers, to "the piece of paper in a ballot box," which a minority of their sex might cast themselves, that choice is their right. That the majority of women prefer a government run by men rather than by men and a minority of women who do not adequately represent their sex, is indisputable. Every fair canvass and election on this subject has demonstrated it so emphatically that the suffragists themselves bitterly oppose all attempts to have the *women* decide this question. They wish to force women to vote on every other political question, but they are unwilling to have them decide this, the most important political question of them all. Why? Because they know that the majority of women do not desire representation in government through their votes, but through their men. It is true that a minority has rights as well as a majority, but those rights do not include the right to force the majority to accept minority methods of political representation which involve an additional burden of no benefit to women and a danger to the State.

A FINAL ANSWER TO OFT-REPEATED QUESTIONS

By Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge
President, National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

THE facts regarding the circulation of anonymous, endless chain, poison pen postcards in an attempt to identify the anti-suffragists with the liquor interests have already been given wide publicity in the press. This statement was issued by the President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage only after these postcards had been coming to our members throughout the country for six months, and only because it marked the climax of the campaign of liquor charges by which the suffragists have attempted to gain through prejudice what they could not win in fair discussion.

The postcards directed the recipients to write to the Woman Suffrage Publishing Company and to the *Woman's Journal* for "positive proof that the anti-suffragists are allied with the liquor interests to defeat prohibition" and "financially supported by them."

The Woman Suffrage Publishing Company emphatically repudiated any responsibility for the circulation of these cards.

"Nothing could be more abhorent to us than the use of our name in any anonymous communication," said Miss Esther Ogden, President of the publishing company.

Anti-suffragists will be glad to know that the company takes this fair and unequivocal stand against the anonymous postcard plot.

The *Woman's Journal*, however, handles the matter in a totally different manner. It published two columns regarding the charge, without expressing any such repudiation, and concluding with the same old charges put in the form of questions. Apparently it does *not repudiate* nor *abhor* the *circulation* of such postcards. It says:

Although the *Woman's Journal* has not sent out any such postal cards as Mrs. Dodge describes, it takes full responsibility for its issues of February 26 and March 18.

Then the excuse is offered that these articles were reprinted from other publications considered reliable. It is not mentioned that Attorney-General Gregory himself has denied the first story, and that the second was denied by the speaker alluded to for a year before it was published in the *Woman's Journal*.

The *Woman's Journal* does not modify its charges, nor offer any proof to sustain its assertions. It says:

The article did claim, and the *Woman's Journal* does claim, that the liquor interests have worked with the anti-suffragists to defeat woman suffrage. The fact that they do so work has been established over and over again.

The word "with" has a definite meaning in the English language—it means "not apart from, among, accompanying," according to Webster.

This charge has never been established. The suffrage organ offers no evidence to support it. It merely reasserts the charges in the form of questions:

Why did you, Mrs. Dodge, not publicly repudiate the support of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Liquor Dealers' Association in the 1915 suffrage campaign?

Because the President of the Pennsylvania Liquor Dealers officially denied that any resolution to assist the anti-suffragists had ever been passed, on the day after this fake story was published in Philadelphia newspapers. Because the President of the National Association signed a sworn statement in June, 1914, repudiating any liquor support whatever and has constantly reiterated that the sworn statement still holds good. Because the officers of the anti-suffrage associations in the two States mentioned denied throughout the campaign that they had asked for or been offered any liquor support. Because the alleged resolution passed by the New Jersey Liquor Association was not an offer of support to the antis any more than the defeat of suffrage resolutions by the New Jersey Federation of Labor and Federation of Women was an offer of support.

Why did you not protest against the general circulation in the same package of your organization's literature and that of the anti-prohibitionists of Ohio, and of which Mrs. H. T. Upton of Warren, Ohio, has affidavits?

Mrs. Upton has no such affidavits and *there was no such general distribution*. Her affidavits allege personal knowledge of one or two instances of this sort. The head of the distributing company, who is a suffragist, signed a contract with us not to distribute our literature with any other, and denies that this contract was violated, but as his company was engaged in the general distribution of literature on all the amendments in Ohio at that election, it is possible that several individual distributors assembled different leaflets together for their own convenience in house to house work. It was admitted by the Ohio suffragists at the suffrage national convention at Nashville that they were "deserted by the drys" in the Ohio election.

Why did your representative, Miss Clara Markeson, seek a working agreement with the *National Forum*, organ of the Montana liquor dealers, secretly, and would you have ever explained about it if the facts had not leaked out?

The intimations of this question are emphatically untrue. Miss Markeson never sought, secretly or otherwise, a working agreement or any other agreement with any liquor organ. She called at the office of the paper "to demand that he cease at once and entirely the publication of articles written by me, taken from the Protest or issued as our leaflets," as I wrote in a statement published on the first page of the Woman's Protest, February, 1914, *nine months before* the Montana election. Miss Markeson herself was the first person to give out information about this incident.

Why did not your association publicly repudiate before election the advertisement signed by its officials and paid for by the Macomb County Liquor Dealers' Association in the 1913 campaign?

A repudiation of all such attempts to ally us with the liquor interests was issued by the secretary and two members of the executive committee of the Michigan Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and appeared in the *Detroit News-Tribune* and the *Detroit Free Press*, Sunday, April 6, 1913, the day after the charge was made and the day before election. For all the facts, see page 14 of the Woman's Protest for August, 1916.

Why did articles signed by Florence Goff Schwarz, business secretary of the Cincinnati Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, appear in the *Liberal Advocate*, official organ of the Ohio Liquor League?

The *Woman's Journal* was informed why over two years ago *by the editor* of the *Liberal Advocate*. (See Woman's Protest, December, 1914, page 9.) The editor said: "We positively deny that we are lined up with any suffrage or anti-suffrage organization. We are just as liable to publish suffrage as well as anti-suffrage matter if the article appeals to us." The paper merely printed a plate sent out to hundreds of other papers in Ohio by the American Press Association. After the anti-suffragists learned the facts, no more plates were sent to the paper. Since that time the *Liberal Advocate* has published *pro-suffrage* articles, even in its editorial columns, on several occasions.

Do you or do you not, willingly accept the support of the liquor men in South Dakota in their campaign to defeat the woman suffrage amendment, and if you do not, why do you not publicly repudiate them in the newspapers of that State?

The South Dakota Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage challenged the president of the suffrage association of that State on October 4, 1916, to show any evidence that liquor representatives were working against woman suffrage. The challenge was not accepted. South Dakota, moreover, has adopted prohibition and defeated woman suffrage, in spite of the suffrage majorities in the wet cities of Deadwood and Lead.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE CAMPAIGNS

GEORGIA

THE regular meeting of the Georgia association was on the twelfth of October. Great stress is put on the educational value of these monthly programs. During the past year they have been efficiently conducted by Mrs. Orrin Massey.

The president told of her cordial reception at the National Directors' meeting, which she attended in September, and urged that as many as possible attend the first annual convention of the National Association in December.

When asked what work the association would do during the Federation of Woman's Clubs, which would meet in Macon, Miss Patterson said the anti-suffragists never introduced the subject of woman suffrage in club circles, feeling in honor bound by the constitution, which said the organization was "non-political and non-sectarian." She further stated, "I understand the suffragists are determined to introduce a suffrage resolution. We will wait until they begin to distribute literature. Then the 'anti-dote' will be ready in the form of plenty of anti-suffrage literature from our own and other sections of the country. If the question is discussed there will be speakers from our association and some from parts of the State we do not expect. There is no doubt it would be against the best interests of the clubs. A prominent woman has said, 'It would sound the death knell of the country clubs.' Many would withdraw. It is time for the anti-suffragists not to be meek and quiet, but find out immediately how the delegates feel."

The president talked to persons from all sections of the State and found with the exception of a few suffragists, some of whom joined the clubs recently, all agreed that the clubs should be separate and distinct from the woman suffrage question.

A number of women agreed to speak against the resolution if the occasion arose. Some were ready to say all of the clubs in their county would withdraw if the convention endorsed this resolution. The resolution was introduced without recommendation from the committee. It was decided to have ten minutes' discussion from each side.

The suffragists were represented by Mrs. S. B. C. Morgan of Savannah and a Miss Freeman. Mrs. S. C. Moore of Macon, a member of the State Executive Board of the Federation, spoke of the fact that many of the country clubs would withdraw; that she understood thirty-seven rural clubs in Florida had left that Federation because of dissatisfaction, since they indorsed suffrage and she asked if they would be selfish enough to injure these clubs they were especially trying to aid.

The next anti-suffragist who spoke was Mrs. Walter Lamar, who said she spoke not as an anti-suffragist nor as a suffragist. She said maybe some day they would find out what she was. She made it plain it was against the best interests of the clubs and alluded to the presence of "trouble makers," some of whom she could call by name, who had never been seen at a meeting before and came now to disturb the peace of the federation, which had been working so well and in such harmony.

After this speaker the State corresponding secretary, Mrs. Walter Grace, arose and dealth the death-blow to suffrage in the convention by "rising to a point of order." She said unless the constitution was changed, which read this is a "non-political, non-sectarian body," the discussion was out of order. The parliamentarian said the chair had a right to rule on this, and the president, Mrs. Z. I. Fitzpatrick, said: "That being the case, I rule the discussion is out of order." The suffragists appealed against the decision of the chair, and when put to the vote of the convention the president was sustained by an overwhelming vote. The applause of anti-suffrage speakers and sentiment showed plainly the federation was against the amendment.

Mrs. Fitzpatrick said that sometimes in a family a child needed to be rebuked, and this "little club (the Woman's Study Club of Atlanta) had stepped beyond its bounds, as the law of the federation is that no club shall submit a question to other clubs without the consent of the president and executive board or of the convention." This club had asked each club to send delegates instructed to vote for woman suffrage, in violation of this law.

The anti-suffragists hope this ends the matter, as the constitution would have to be changed to make it right for the question to be considered.

The W. C. T. U. of Georgia voted overwhelmingly against indorsing woman suffrage. This question has been voted down every year since their organization, over twenty-five years.

The president received many congratulations on the action of the clubs, to which she replied, "The toast to drink to me is, long may it remain so." Mrs. Walter Lamar entertained the State Federation of Clubs, 500 people, and in the receiving line had four presidents of State organizations: Mrs. Fitzpatrick, president of the Georgia Federation of Woman's Clubs; Mrs. Howard McCall, State Regent, D. A. R.; Mrs. Herbert Franklin, president of the U. D. C.'s and Miss Caroline Patterson, president of the Georgia Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

MAINE

THERE are rumors that Maine may become a campaign State. At least the State suffragists have passed a resolution to work for a referendum, but it is believed this was mainly for publicity purposes.

It is not thought that the "cause" is eager to take on another campaign in a prohibition State after its recent experiences in Iowa, West Virginia and South Dakota, for if several more "dry" States defeat woman suffrage at the polls, "the only suffrage argument" will be as dead as their "declaration of sentiments" of 1848.

The Maine association, however, is preparing to meet any exigencies that may arise with reference to the State and the Congressional situation. The literature committee, of which Mrs. Clarence Hale is chairman, is getting out leaflets for general distribution to arouse the people to the dangers of woman suffrage in advance of any actual campaign. Mrs. Hale is also speaking at some of the big fairs and other gatherings.

Maine is greatly interested in the forthcoming National Anti-Suffrage Convention at Washington.

MASSACHUSETTS

OCTOBER proved a busy and eventful month for our association. The booth at the food fair was open day and evening for four weeks and 1,500 men, women and juniors enrolled their names as being opposed to suffrage. The interest of our members all over the State is on the increase and the activities are hardly less than during the campaign.

On October 25th more than one hundred enthusiastic antis attended a chairmen's meeting held at Mrs. William Lowell Putnam's, 49 Beacon Street, Boston. Mrs. Putnam presided, delegates from Arlington, Baldwinsville, Bedford, Beverly, Boston, Braintree, Bridgewater, Brighton, Brookline, Cambridge, Canton, Cohasset, Concord, Dedham, Dover, Melrose, Milton, Needham, North Easton, Newton, North Andover, Norwood, Roxbury, Salem, Sharon, Taunton, Waltham, Watertown, Wellesley, Westwood, New Bedford and Winchester answered the roll call. Mrs. Balch, the president, spoke generally on the affairs of the association and aroused much enthusiasm with her description of plans for the future. Mrs. Codman, State treasurer, spoke on the financial situation and Mrs. Edwin Ford, convention manager, gave in detail the plans for the National Convention to be held in Washington, December 7th

and 8th, which will be attended by a large delegation from this State. Mrs. A. H. Parker of Dover announced that a Thanksgiving market would be held at old campaign headquarters, 685 Boylston Street, just before Thanksgiving, where all sorts of goodies will be offered for sale, an enjoyable and profitable entertainment is anticipated. Mrs. William P. Shreve announced that arrangements had been completed for a luncheon to be given at Cook's restaurant, 150 Boylston Street, Boston, Thursday, November 16th, the luncheon to be preceded by a conference to be attended by delegates from the New England anti-suffrage associations. Mrs. Putnam was the recipient of congratulations on her appointment to the office of first vice-president of the American Association for the Study and the Prevention of Infant Mortality, being the first woman who has ever occupied that office. After the meeting refreshments were served.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912,

Of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, published monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1916.

STATE OF NEW YORK } ss.
COUNTY OF NEW YORK }

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says she is the editor of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:
Publisher: The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.
Editor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.
Managing Editor: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.
Business Manager: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

2. That the owners are:
National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.
Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.
Mrs. Wm. B. Glover, Secretary, Fairfield, Conn.
Miss Caroline W. Stewart, Treasurer, Glen Ridge, New Jersey.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are:
None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this thirteenth day of October, 1916.

CHARLES EDGAR,
Notary Public No. 1384, Queens County.
[SEAL] Certificate filed in New York County, No. 37 Register's Office, No. 7055.
My commission expires March 30, 1917.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

THE annual meeting of the New Hampshire Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was held in Manchester. The following officers were elected: President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter; vice-presidents, Mrs. D. D. Felton, Manchester; Mrs. W. K. Robbins, Manchester; Mrs. Ira Harris, Nashua; Mrs. Charles R. Mooney, Newport; Mrs. A. H. Harriman, Laconia; Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. T. C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. William R. Varick, Manchester; Mrs. George Warren, Manchester; Miss Marcia Emery, Derry; recording secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord; corresponding secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord; treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

A contribution to the National Association was voted, and plans for the National Convention at Washington were presented. A committee consisting of Mrs. George H. Moses, chairman, and Mrs. W. K. Robbins, Mrs. Frank S. Streeter, Mrs. George S. Edgell and Miss Elizabeth P. Grouard was appointed for convention arrangements in this State.

A very interesting and stimulating address from Mrs. B. L. Robinson of the Massachusetts association was followed by lively questions and discussion. Mrs. J. B. Murdock, once a voter in a Western State, told of her observations of conditions there, which had made her a strong opponent of suffrage.

NEW YORK

THE New York State Association has before it a busy month that will outhum the proverbial beehive with not a drone in it.

Between now and December 10th there is a MOVING into the most attractive headquarters the State Association has yet had, an ANNUAL MEETING, a HOUSEWARMING, a CHRISTMAS SALE and a special train to the National Convention in Washington. All this in addition to the usual State work and aftermath of a national election.

NEW HEADQUARTERS: Foster Building, 280 Madison Avenue (40th Street). Large, light, corner suite, in a recently completed building; excellent location, convenient to transportation and shopping centers. Besides suitable offices, there is an assembly room especially adapted to the varied business and social events on a winter's program that will have a personal appeal to every member and friend of the Association. These new offices have been made possible by the interest and generosity of one member of the executive committee, who gives the rent as her contribution to the coming campaign year.

ANNUAL MEETING AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS: The first Monday in December (December 4th) will be held at the new headquarters. Followed by a

HOUSEWARMING, from 4.30 to 6.30, in which all members, active and sustaining, are invited to share.

CHRISTMAS SALE: An opportunity to do your Christmas shopping early will be afforded in connection with the housewarming. Christmas cards and calendars, cups and saucers and Christmas bags, including comfort bags for the men on the border, will be on sale. In order to have an unrivaled collection, donations are asked for from members of the Association, to be sent to 280 Madison Avenue, Room 402, after December 1st.

CONVENTION AT WASHINGTON: The special train from New York City to the National Anti-Suffrage Convention in Washington, leaves the Pennsylvania Station at 8.30 A. M., Thursday morning, December 7th, arriving in Washington at 1.30. Many of the up-State members, finding it inconvenient to make this train, will go in groups from their own localities. Those who wish to join the New York party will have places reserved for them on the train and in the hotels by communicating with Mrs. Ernest R. Adee, chairman of the committee, Tuxedo Park, N. Y.

As the anti-suffrage convention week is also the week of the opening of Congress, with other activities in Washington that make it one of the notable weeks of the year, anti-suffragists are urgently requested to make their reservations at the earliest possible moment.

Those who attended the national meeting in Washington last year have been the first and the most enthusiastic in making reservations for this year and they are extending invitations to the men of the family.

STATE COUNCIL: The Council of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, organized for the purpose of outlining State policies and coming together three times a year, held its October meeting in Buffalo, Mrs. Frank W. Fiske, Jr., president of the Buffalo auxiliary, presiding. There were very interesting sessions, both morning and afternoon, with a luncheon for seventy-five in the small dining-room of the Hotel Iroquois. The council is composed of the chairman and one member of each local auxiliary entitled to representation. The next meeting will be held in Rochester in January.

OHIO

THE poll of women of voting age in Ohio is an eye-opener to those who believe that women desire the ballot.

The poll at the present showing stands, with Cleveland added, 101,905 for the antis as against 7,103 suffragists, a majority of 94,802, or 93.8 per cent., in favor of the anti-suffragists. The canvassers who are now working Cleveland report at this date

12,000 anti-suffragists, 1,406 suffragists and 124 who are neutral in that city.

On the occasion of President Wilson's visit to Cincinnati when he came upon the stage at Music Hall to speak to the thousands there assembled, the following message from the Ohio Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was presented to him by Chairman Sykes: "Greetings to the President from the Ohio Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

"We respectfully submit the figures of our verified referendum poll of women over twenty-one years of age in the cities covered to date:

	Suffragists	Anti-Suffragists
Columbus	2,447	20,825
Cincinnati	800	40,600
Circleville	91	1,174
Chillicothe	242	3,009
Dayton	1,788	20,187
Lancaster	219	2,747
Washington, C. H...	110	1,363
Totals.....	5,697	89,905"

The communication was signed Mrs. H. E. Talbott, President of the Ohio Association; Mrs. Lawrence Maxwell, Jr., President of the Cincinnati and Hamilton County Association, per Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarz, Secretary.

THE ONE WAY A FAILURE

There is only one way in which women with the vote can make their influence felt; only one way in which they can be anything but the political echoes of men—by forming partisan organizations of their own.

When the "Woman's Party" tried this method it was simply carrying out the inevitable logic of the woman suffrage movement. Practically every woman who wants a vote, wants it because she thinks that with it she can do something more or something different than men will do for her without it. She desires it as an instrument of force, a lever by which she can put her own ideas into government and legislation in spite of man and all his works. She is *forced,* if a true believer in woman suffrage, to attempt to organize and put a party of her own in power.

The failure of the "Woman's Party" is a demonstration that it is impossible to organize such an institution successfully; that the women voters cannot be formed into a party, and consequently cannot introduce through the vote, any measure for the advancement of their sex which they could not obtain without all this waste of money, time and energy, as women out of politics and disinterested non-partisans.

Picture a leader of the "Woman's Party" asking favors of the Democrats—or rewards from the Republicans. This is the position in which the suffragists desire to place all women.

"DRY" NOTES AND COMMENT

"WHY do you anti-suffragists print so much about the liquor question and woman suffrage?" a reader asks.

There are perfectly good reasons—several of them:

1. Because the liquor cry is the only argument advanced in the overwhelming majority of all suffrage speeches and literature.

2. Because it is the only method by which many good people are misled on this issue.

3. Because, when it is shown unjust, unfair and untenable, woman suffrage must come out from behind the shadow of the great prohibition movement, and face the facts alone.

4. Because, without the liquor cry, the suffrage movement, with radicals leading its ranks, with its alliance with socialism and feminism, its contempt for women's own opinion of their enfranchisement, and its record of failure, cannot win enough followers to wage any successful campaign.

5. Because fully 90 per cent. of all inquiries for literature and material for debates which come into anti-suffrage headquarters ask for information on "the liquor question."

The anti-suffragists have always claimed that it is impossible to change man's relation to liquor by changing woman's relation to government. The last election adds the following facts in support of this truth:

1. South Dakota, where the suffragists spread the wildest charges ever made in any campaign that the anti-suffragists were supported by the liquor interests, adopted prohibition and defeated woman suffrage *on the same day.*

2. West Virginia, a prohibition State, where these charges were almost equally frequent and bitter, gave the anti-suffragists *on the same day* the greatest proportionate victory the people of any State have registered against votes for women.

3. Nebraska, which defeated woman suffrage in 1914, adopted prohibition.

4. Michigan, which defeated suffrage twice, the second time by an increased anti-suffrage majority of over 95,000, became the banner "dry" State of the Union, as it is the largest to adopt prohibition.

5. California, largest full suffrage State (but which is smaller in population than Michigan) defeated prohibition *for the second time with women voting.*

This is what happened to the suffrage liquor *cry in one day.*

The prohibition movement is too big, and has made too much headway to allow any one to confuse its platform with any other.

A poll of the men who have voted half the States in the Union dry would probably show an overwhelming majority against votes for women.

There are now twenty-three prohibition States:

Kansas, Maine, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Georgia, Tennessee, North Carolina, West Virginia, Alabama, Arizona, South Carolina, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, Virginia, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska and South Dakota (given in the order of the adoption of prohibition).

Of the twenty-three prohibition States, seventeen have "gone dry" since 1912.

Sixteen *of the prohibition States* have rejected woman suffrage within the last two years. Six of them have defeated the "cause" at the polls. Ten have defeated suffrage in their legislatures.

The anti-suffragists have won sixteen State campaigns at the polls since 1912!

Neither prohibition nor the opposition to woman suffrage obtained a "plank" in either party's platform—but they got the people's votes just the same.

Among the principles recently demonstrated are these:

It is better to be right with the people than "in" with the politicians.

An ounce of common sense goes farther with a thoughtful people than a ton of agitation, a bag of gold, a book of press notices, a series of false charges and a carload of wordy "indorsements."

"Vote Against Wilson, He Opposes National Woman Suffrage."

"A Vote for the Democratic Party Is a Vote Against Women."

"He Kept Us Out of Suffrage."

These were the slogans with which the "Woman's Party" fought the administration in the States where women vote. Ten of the eleven full suffrage States, including Utah, hitherto Republican, gave their electoral votes to the party and the President who "kept us out of suffrage!"

"The lady from Montana will not only be the first representative of her sex in Congress. She will be a constant reminder to the Republicans of what happened. * * * West of the Mississippi."—*N. Y. World.*

"Women in Despair at Election Result"—Headline, *N. Y. Tribune,* November 10th. "Despair lay heavy over the headquarters of the Woman's Party yesterday. This is the organization which set out to inflame the Western women voters against President Wilson because of his refusal to indorse Federal woman suffrage. The returns from the Western States show, with almost brutal frankness, that the women voters did not respond to the suffrage call."

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE
FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 37 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set, 50 cts. Single copies, 5 cts.
Selected packages, 25 cts.

PAMPHLETS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman's Relation to Government — *Mrs. Wm. F. Scott*
Taxation and Suffrage — *Frederick Dwight*
First Legislative Address — *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law Dodgers
Suffrage a Cult of Self and Sex — *Dr. Charles L. Dana*
Some Catholic Views
Red Behind the Yellow
Suffrage Not a Right — *Hon. Henry L. Stimson*
Woman Will Not Gain by Suffrage — *Judge Edgar M. Cullen*
An Argument Against the Woman Suffrage Amendment — *Stephen H. Olin*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Case Against Votes for Women — *Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge*
The Militant and the Child — *Mrs. F. M. Scott*
Woman's Rights *vs.* Woman's Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement, etc. — *John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — *Minnie Bronson*
Wage-Earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government — *Prof. Edward Cope*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Should Women Vote? — *Joseph Gilpin Pyle*
Xantippe on Woman Suffrage — *Reprint from Yale Review*
Feminism and Socialism — *Reprint from Unpopular Review*
Dodgers—Statistics

Silk Pins.....10c. each — Ribbon.....10c. and 15c. a yard
Celluloid Buttons.....5c. — Pennants.....15c. and 25c.
New Poster Stamps.....35c. a hundred
Cartoon—Population Votes.....50c.
New Song—The Anti-Suffrage Rose.....10c.

MAN-SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

52 Broadway Room 926 New York City

PUBLICATIONS

The Woman and the Vote. Address Carnegie Hall, January 26, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Feminist Revolutionary Principle Biologically Unsound — *Prof. William T. Sedgwick*
Brief Submitted to House of Representatives, July, 1914 — *Everett P. Wheeler*
Colorado and Suffrage — *John C. Ten Eyck*
Consent of the Governed — *Prof. Munroe Smith*
The Woman Suffrage Crisis
(Editorial, *New York Times*, February 8, 1915)
Brief on Woman Suffrage; Political Suffrage for Women Subversive of American Ideals.
The Laws of New York Favor and Protect Woman — *Raymond B. Seymour, of the New York Bar*
What Women Have Done Without the Ballot — *Everett P. Wheeler*
(Republished by Permission from *The Reply*.)
Price 5 cents each—25 for $1.00

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

Feminism ($1.50) — *Mr. and Mrs. John Martin*
The Eden Sphinx ($1.25) — *Mrs. Annie Riley Hale*
Anti-Suffrage Essays—by Massachusetts Women
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
Vocation of Woman ($1.50) — *Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage ($1.00) — *Sir Almroth Wright*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
The Unrest of Women ($1.00) — *E. S. Martin*
Votes for Men (50c.)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

The Remonstrance.....Subscription, 25c.
687 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

The Case Against Woman Suffrage. A Manual.
Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Argument before U. S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcroft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and not to Men
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*
Woman Suffrage in Practice—An Answer to George Creel.
Address in Opposition to Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. George A. Caswell*
Anti-Suffrage Manual (15c. a copy) — *Mrs. Albert T. Leatherbee*
An Anti-Suffrage Creed — *Adapted from Octavia Hill*
A Social Worker's View of Suffrage — *Mrs. Wm. Lowell Putnam*
Suffrage Statements Answered
Twelve Anti-Suffrage Reasons — *Caroline M. Parker*
Why a Man Should Oppose Woman Suffrage — *Frank Foxcroft*
Woman Suffrage Must Fail — *Mrs. A. J. George* (Independent)
Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform — *Margaret C. Robinson*
Woman Suffrage a Failure in California

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association,
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street BOSTON, MASS.
Selected Packages, 25c.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1916

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
37 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....years' subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate, $1.00 a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....